

Appl. No.: 10/585,179
Reply to Office Action of: 05/29/2009

REMARKS

In regard to the objection to the disclosure (page 5) and the drawings mentioned on page 2 of the office action, the description at page 5 has been amended to overcome the objections.

Claim 1 has also been amended to include the feature of the sheet being configured such that it wants to return to the flat configuration were it not held in the folded configuration. Support for this amendment can be derived from page 6, lines 9 to 11 of the specification.

Claim 9 has now been amended to define that the sheet is configured to allow it to be bendable back on itself. We believe that the meaning of this term is adequately clear (see, for example, page 5, lines 26-27) and refers to a property of the sheet which allows it to bend to such a degree that it can be folded that its opposing ends no longer face substantially away from another (one extreme being a 'U' shape configuration, see new Claim 29).

You will note that some of the dependent claims have been amended to clearly relate to properties of the cover ("configured to") and states (e.g. folded/unfolded) of the cover.

We have also corrected Claim 19 to remove the extra repetition of "actuators".

Claim 22 has been amended to a method of distributing a cover according to Claim 1, comprising providing the cover in an

Appl. No.: 10/585,179
Reply to Office Action of: 05/29/2009

unfolded configuration, and distributing with cover along with a printed publication.

Basis for new Claims 27 and 28 is from page 7 lines 15-17. Basis for new Claims 29 and 30 is from page 7 lines 19-21 and page 7 lines 10-13 respectively. These provide dependent claims for important sub-features of the present invention. These should also aid understanding of the scope of the corresponding independent claim.

Claim 31 is a new method claim and takes support from Claim 1. This claim is directed towards the act of covering the device with the claimed cover. We believe that both Claim 31 and Claim 22 are allowable within the same application. However, if you consider that this is not the case, please let us know and we can consider removing Claim 31.

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jensfelt (US 6,330,430). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensfelt (US 6,330,430). Claims 14, 16-19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensfelt (US 6,330,430) in view of Buesseler et al. (US 2003/0036362 A1). Claims 7 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensfelt (US 6,330,430) in view of Nagashima (JP 2000/299722 A). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Jensfelt discloses a case for a mobile phone. The case is formed with fasteners so as to secure the case around a mobile device. The case as disclosed is best shown in Figure 4 of *Jensfelt*.

Appl. No.: 10/585,179

Reply to Office Action of: 05/29/2009

In contrast, the present invention discloses a cover for a mobile phone. The cover of the present application is provided from a sheet of "resilient" material, in that it has a desire to return to a flat unfolded configuration when not being held (see Claim 1). There is no teaching in the prior art of using the resilient property of a material in providing a cover that wants to return to a flat configuration were it not held in a folded configuration as claimed.

We therefore submit that the present independently claimed invention is novel over the teaching of the prior art by at least this feature.

With regard to non-obviousness and inventive step, we consider that the present independently claimed invention is not obvious from the teaching of the prior art.

Firstly, we can see no direction in the prior art to provide for a resilient cover made from a sheet of material that is configured in the claimed manner. Therefore, we cannot see how the features of the independently claimed invention could be arrived at from the teaching of the prior art, in particular *Jensfelt*.

With regard to the other prior art documents, we consider that they do not disclose features that would or could be taken in combination with the teaching of *Jensfelt* to arrive at the present claimed invention.

Pan (US 2004/0,180,706) describes an exchangeable décor panel for a portable cellular phone. The panel is made of a flexible material but is made to be rigid (i.e. inflexible and

Appl. No.: 10/585,179

Reply to Office Action of: 05/29/2009

non-resilient) using rigid plates 3 & 4 (see Fig. 4). The panel does not comprise a flat and folded configuration, nor is it configured to want to return to the flat configuration

BEST AVAILABLE COPY